



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,921	11/09/2001	Chunzeng Li	528.001	1030
7590	09/12/2005		EXAMINER	
JAY G. DURST BOYLE FREDERICKSON NEWHOLM STEIN & GRATZ 250 PLAZA SUITE 1030 250 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE MILWAUKEE, WI 53202			OLSEN, KAJ K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1753	
DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/052,921	LI ET AL.	
	Examiner Kaj K. Olsen	Art Unit 1753	
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --			
THE REPLY FILED 29 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>			
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>			
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>			
AMENDMENTS			
<p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: <u>see attached discussion</u>. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>			
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>			
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p>			
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>			
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____. </p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____. </p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>26-42</u>. </p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p>			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>			
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>			
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>see attached discussion</u>.</p>			
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____</p>			
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>			

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The resubmitted Declaration is approved of and the examiner has withdrawn the previous objection to it.
2. Applicant's amendment will not be entered because the explicit recitation of the polar solution and the changing of "at" to "in" is a new issue requiring further consideration. See paragraphs 4 and 23 of the final rejection and paragraph 1 of the non-final rejection for evidence that the applicant has clearly changed the scope of claim 26 after-final.
3. Applicant's various arguments concerning claim 26 have not been further considered in view of these new issues.
4. With respect to claim 37, applicant urges that Horrocks contains no discussion of feeding back the potential to control tip-sample separation. It is unclear what the applicant's point here is because the examiner admitted as much in the rejection. Claim 37 was rejected over a *combination* of Horrocks and Kwak. In particular, Kwak was utilized to teach the obviousness of using a feedback circuit. See paragraph 18 of the final rejection. If applicant believes the examiner was in error with his combination, then the applicant is invited to explain why one possessing ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to the feedback circuit of Kwak for the probe of Horrocks. However, merely pointing out that the primary teaching fails to teach an element is not persuasive when the rejection itself relied on a secondary teaching for that element.
5. Applicant also urges that functional limitations cannot be ignored and drew the examiner's attention to MPEP 2173.05(g). However, MPEP 2173.05(g) concerns whether

functional limitations are indefinite or not. Because the examiner did not find these particular functional limitations indefinite (see paragraph 10 of the final rejection), the appropriate portion of the MPEP for giving functional limitations appropriate weight is MPEP 2114. MPEP 2114 states that recitation with respect to the manner which a device is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. See *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647. The examiner is of the position that the bi-potentiostat of Horrocks could provide the set forth function of the claim, and applicant does not appear to have argued to the contrary. Hence, it is unnecessary for Horrocks to teach the set forth function if Horrocks were capable of providing that function.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaj Olsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1344. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 5:30 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen, can be reached on 571-272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AU 1753
September 7, 2005



KAJ K. OLSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER